United Nations A/HRC/WG.6/19/GNQ/3

General Assembly

Distr.: General
21 January 2014
English
Original: English/Spanish

Human Rights Council
Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review
Nineteenth session
28 April–9 May 2014

Summary prepared by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) of the annex to Human Rights Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21

Equatorial Guinea*

The present report is a summary of 9 stakeholders' submissions[1] to the universal periodic review. It follows the general guidelines adopted by the Human Rights Council in its decision 17/119. It does not contain any opinions, views or suggestions on the part of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), nor any judgement or determination in relation to specific claims. The information included herein has been systematically referenced in endnotes and, to the extent possible, the original texts have not been altered. As provided for in Resolution 16/21 of the Human Rights Council, where appropriate, a separate section is provided for contributions by the national human rights institution of the State under review that is accredited in full compliance with the Paris Principles. The full texts of all submissions received are available on the OHCHR website. The report has been prepared taking into consideration the periodicity of the review and developments during that period.

* The present document was not edited before being sent to United Nations translation services.

GE.14-10438 (E) 030314 050314

1410438

Please recycle

I. Information provided by other stakeholders

A. Background and framework

1. Scope of international obligations

1. JS2-EGJUSTICE-RIDH reported that a number of treaties have not been ratified and that no steps have been taken towards their ratification (as recommended in its previous review).[2] AI stated that Equatorial Guinea agreed to consider ratifying the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture (OP-CAT) and that however, no steps have been taken in that direction.[3] HRW recommended Equatorial Guinea to ratify the Rome Statute.[4] AI recommended ratifying the Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political rights (ICCPR-OP 2), aiming at the abolition of the death penalty.[5] JS3-GDDHH-CNOSC recommended acceding to and ratifying the African Charter on Democracy, Elections and Governance; the Protocol to the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights on the Establishment of an African Court on Human and Peoples' Rights; the African Youth Charter; the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities; and the African Union Convention on Preventing and Combating Corruption.[6]

2. Constitutional and legislative framework

2. JS1 reported that the 2011 referendum to amend the Constitution and the 2013 legislative elections had been beset by a series of abuses and harassment of the opposition.[7] JS3 pointed out that the 2011 constitutional referendum had been publicly announced only a few days before the voting date.[8] HRW informed that the referendum had not been shared with political parties until the day before the referendum campaign opened.[9] JS2 affirmed that the commission appointed to draft the Constitutional reforms lacked independence.[10] HRW affirmed that the National Election Commission was controlled by the ruling party[11] and recommended establishing an independent electoral body.[12] JS1 reported that the Government had prevented the opposition from accessing the national media during the constitutional referendum and the elections of 26 May 2013.[13] JS1 recommended introducing an effective policy framework for consultations and negotiations with political parties and civil society with a view to creating electoral conditions that guaranteed greater transparency and electoral credibility.[14]

3. AI stated that the revised Constitution fails to increase the limited human rights provisions already enshrined in the 1995 Constitution, which are routinely violated.[15] HRW stated that the 2011constitutional changes place term limits on the presidency, but otherwise entrench and expand the President's unchecked powers, including allowing him to name 15 members of Senate.[16]

4. JS2 asserted that with the exception of law 6/2006 on the Prevention and Punishment of Torture, which reflects some of the provisions of the Convention against Torture, no legislation has been enacted to incorporate provisions of treaties into national law.[17] AI stated that the Penal and Penal Procedures Codes, breach Equatorial Guinea's international human rights commitments and its Constitution.[18]

3. Institutional and human rights infrastructure and policy measures

5. JS1-CPDS-ASODEGUE said that they were not aware whether the Government had organized national consultations to discuss the human rights situation in the country since the 2009 universal periodic review, or whether it had publicly announced the organization of an inclusive process to follow up the recommendations of that review.[19] RWBI

recommended to establish sincere and effective cooperation mechanisms with UPR and implement accepted recommendations.[20]

6. JS2 affirmed that the new Constitution gave power to the President to appoint the Ombudsman and the members of an Audit Court, contrary to the Paris principles.[21] HRW highlighted that the "independent" oversight bodies created under the new constitution had not been established and that the president declared that the new presidential term limits would not apply retroactively.[22] AI expressed concern that the ombudsman is appointed by the President[23] and that, given the lack of independence of state institutions responsible for human rights, it is all the more important that the ombudsman is established in accordance with the Paris Principles and fully independent of government and presidential control.[24] JS3 recommended that the Office of the Ombudsman should begin operating by August 2014 and should be provided with adequate resources.[25]

7. JS3 noted that there was no decree defining the functions of the Government's Human Rights Department.[26] JS3 stated that the National Human Rights Commission was not independent, in view of the fact that the President of the Parliament was also the President of the Commission,[27] and recommended reforming the status of the Commission by December 2014.[28]

8. JS3 recommended continuing and extending activities and training on the promotion and protection of human rights to all members of the Administration, in cooperation with civil society.[29]

B. Cooperation with human rights mechanisms

1. Cooperation with treaty bodies

9. JS2 stated that Equatorial Guinea has thus far ignored its reporting obligations under almost all of the ratified treaties,[30] and that it failed to present its initial report to the Committee on Economic and Social Rights in May 2012 (initially due in 1990).[31] HRW recommended to report promptly to relevant treaty bodies.[32]

2. Cooperation with special procedures

10. HRW recommended permitting and clearly authorizing UN human rights experts to enter Equatorial Guinea, travel freely, meet with a range of official and private persons, and carry out independent work without hindrance or risk of retaliation against those who share information.[33] JS1 noted that it was not known whether the State had addressed an open invitation to the special procedures.[34] JS3 recommended issuing an open, standing invitation to the special procedures by September 2014 and agreeing prompt visits.[35]

C. Implementation of international human rights obligations, taking into account applicable international humanitarian law

1. Equality and non-discrimination

11. The Bubi indigenous people of the island of Bioko (EPIBIB) reported that they were the victims of subjugation, total discrimination and contempt.[36] EPIBIB noted that members of the Bubi indigenous people could not work in the public administration because of discrimination against that group.[37] EPIBIB recommended that the State should respect their freedom to promote the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.[38]

2. Right to life, liberty and security of the person

12. HRW reported that Equatorial Guinea tortured, abducted, and forced to confess to participating in an attack on the presidential palace,[39] four nationals living in exile who were held in secret detention and then executed in August 2010 following a military trial that violated international human rights standards.[40] JS1 said that the four persons had been tried summarily by a military court in violation of the law and that the executions were considered political assassinations.[41] AI asserted they were executed in secret within one hour of being sentenced, deprived of their right to appeal and to seek clemency.[42]

13. JS3 stated that, despite the commitments undertaken, the death penalty continued to be applied,[43] and recommended introducing a moratorium on the death penalty by July 2014.[44] AI stated that death penalty has been applied to political opponents convicted of crimes against the state in unfair trials, usually by military courts.[45]

14. AI stated that since 2009, several people, including foreigners, have been killed at road blocks after refusing to pay bribes with no investigations into most of these cases.[46] JS3 noted that police investigation methods were outdated; there was no forensic police; autopsies were not carried out in murder cases and the evidence obtained was inadequate.[47] JS1 recommended that suspicious, violent deaths should be investigated.[48] EPIBIB recommended that the enforced disappearance, torture and deaths of Bubis should be investigated.[49]

15. JS2 affirmed that despite the existence of a law forbidding it, torture is used by security personnel against civilians.[50] JS2 recommended to carry on independent, thorough and impartial investigations and prosecute not only those who carry out acts of torture but also the political authorities who order or condone it.[51] AI stated that torture and other ill-treatments occur mainly in pre-trial detention and that political detainees may be subjected to prolonged incommunicado detention.[52] AI recommended that Equatorial Guinea ensure reparation, including compensation, for victims of torture.[53]

16. JS3 reported that abuse of power was widespread and that it was common for the authorities to use State media for personal motives or for political propaganda purposes.[54] JS2 asserted that the State continues to engage in politically motivated arrests, arbitrary, warrantless, and prolonged incommunicado detentions, and criminal prosecutions to intimidate or punish dissidents.[55] AI asserted that Equatorial Guinea has not fulfilled its commitment to end incommunicado, secret detention and enforced disappearances.[56] AI recommended to disclose the whereabouts of all persons detained and ensure that all detainees are officially registered and have access to their families and lawyers.[57]

17. JS2 stated that the right not to be arbitrarily arrested is easily ignored, as political opponents, whether real or perceived, are routinely harassed, arrested and held for varying periods, often incommunicado and without charge.[58] AI stated that the confinement of political opponents to their areas of origin is a common practice, as it is the secret transfer of detainees to prisons in other parts of the country, and that no steps were taken to end arbitrary arrest and detention of political opponents.[59] JS2 recommended ending the practice of arbitrary arrest to silence critics and ensure that those arrested are brought promptly before a court to determine the legality of their arrest.[60] HRW expressed that judicial processes are used to intimidate or punish those perceived as disloyal to those in power, and that the government also at times detains family members as a form of pressure.[61]

18. AI recommended to ensure that detainees are brought before a judge to determine the legality of their detention within the 72 hours prescribed by law and that those suspected of a criminal offence are promptly charged and tried.[62] JS1 recommended that the Government should guarantee that habeas corpus was used effectively.[63]

19. JS1 recommended that there should be regular follow-up of all prisoners and the exact duration of their sentences so that they were released once they had served their terms and not kept in prison indefinitely.[64] JS1 cited cases of persons held in total solitary confinement without being charged and without access to legal counsel or medical assistance.[65]

20. HRW informed that visits to prisons and jails from lawyers and others indicate that serious abuses continue, including beatings that amount to torture.[66] JS1 referred to prison staff routinely subjecting prisoners to threats and violent and physical abuse, prison overcrowding, a lack of protection for women and girls, a lack of training programmes and social reintegration, and persons who remained in prison despite having served their long sentences.[67] JS3 stated that, although progress had been made in the prison register following visits to prisons by the Attorney-General, the process had not been institutionalized and the prison authorities still did not submit monthly lists of prisoners.[68] JS3 noted that there was no separation between remand prisoners and convicted prisoners and that both women and minors were held in the same quarters as adult men.[69] JS3 recommended establishing a registration and control system for prisons by December 2014 and publishing biannual reports.[70]

21. JS1 recommended allowing civil society and human rights organizations in the country to freely visit places of detention.[71]

22. JS3 referred to the alarming increase in the rape of young girls and the Government's passivity in addressing the issue and punishing those responsible.[72] ACEDEVADEMA noted that women were often the victims of forced labour or subjected to conditions of slavery in domestic servitude, and that they were often the victims of sexual exploitation[73] or were forced to marry.[74]

23. ACEDEVADEMA reported that there continued to be cases of trafficking in persons,[75] largely shielded by the authorities or certain elements thereof,[76] that legislation to prosecute and punish those activities was not applied,[77] that there was no protection or support policy[78] and that the Government had not implemented any of the recommendations of the 2010 universal periodic review, including: ensuring that violence against women and children constitutes a criminal offence, taking further measures to prevent the trafficking of children, intensifying efforts to provide assistance to child victims of trafficking and holding the perpetrators of trafficking accountable.[79] ACEDEVADEMA recommended enhancing the application of the Anti-Trafficking Act to prosecute traffickers and complicit officials, training the police force to investigate cases of trafficking in persons and introducing a national plan against trafficking in persons.[80]

24. ACEDEVADEMA reported that, due to their vulnerability, foreign workers continued to be subjected to involuntary servitude, and that the growth of the oil sector had contributed to greater demand for prostitution services and children working in domestic service, markets and cleaning.[81] ACEDEVADEMA reported that no programme had been implemented to tackle forced child labour.[82]

25. JS3 said that the fact that women were no longer imprisoned for failure to repay their dowry following separation or divorce was an important step forward.[83] JS3 noted that the Government had not taken any measures to effectively combat domestic violence, which continued to be widespread, considering that 63 per cent of women over the age of 15 had been subjected to some form of violence and 32 per cent had been the victims of sexual violence.[84]

26. GIEACPC stated that in Equatorial Guinea corporal punishment of children remains lawful in home, schools, penal institutions and alternative care settings, despite the recommendations to prohibit it by the Committee on the Rights of the Child and the Government's acceptance of relevant UPR recommendations.[85]

27. HRW affirmed that the government's disregard of its human rights commitments is evident in its actions against human rights defenders from Equatorial Guinea who delivered statements to the Human Rights Council in 2010 and that these individuals have faced a variety of repercussions for their criticisms of the government.[86]

3. Administration of justice, including impunity, and the rule of law

28. AI stated that underlying violations such as torture and arbitrary detentions is impunity. AI affirmed impunity is virtually guaranteed by the absence of the rule of law and a weak and politicised judicial system which itself often violates human rights.[87] AI added that only rarely are human rights violations investigated and perpetrators brought to justice.[88] AI asserted that police and soldiers continue to enjoy almost total impunity for unlawful killings, including extrajudicial executions.[89]

29. HRW asserted that the actual President, who is designated as the country's "chief magistrate" and chairs the body that oversees judges, exercises inordinate control over the judiciary, which lacks independence, and judges say they need to consult with the office of the president regarding their decisions in sensitive cases.[90]

30. JS3 said that, under the new Constitution, the President of the Government was both the President of the Higher Council of the Judiciary and the Chief Magistrate of the Nation, and had the authority to directly appoint the President and the members of the Supreme Court, the Constitutional Court and the Court of Auditors.[91] JS3 noted that the situation was in violation of the principle of the separation of powers and demonstrated the lack of checks and balances on the executive branch.[92] JS3 said that 35 per cent of current members of the Senate were also members of the Government and that it was expressly prohibited by law for members of parliament to hold another public office.[93]

31. JS3 pointed out that, in practice, the judiciary lacked independence and allowed impunity for official acts.[94] JS2 affirmed that judges lack the training and independence to adjudicate, hold security forces accountable for human rights violations, and protect the due process rights of victims.[95] HRW recommended to undertake a comprehensive reform to ensure judicial independence and otherwise bring the judicial system into compliance with the international human rights instruments to which Equatorial Guinea is a party.[96]

32. JS3 indicated that remedies of appeal and cassation were rarely applied because of a lack of adequate legal representation and poor knowledge of constitutional rights, and that the necessary measures for the establishment of an effective system of court-appointed public defenders had not been taken.[97]

33. AI asserted that military courts have been used to try civilians in the past four years where judges and defence counsels are appointed by military or political authorities, and that political opponents and other critics have been tried on trumped-up charges usually of plotting against government and that whether tried by a military or civilian court, these trials fail to meet international standards of fairness.[98] AI informed that courts accept confessions obtained under torture, including in cases where this constitutes the sole evidence against defendants.[99]

34. AI recommended ensuring that all trials are conducted in accordance with international standards and that no one is tried twice for the same offence, that military courts are used solely to try military personnel on purely military matters, and that statements made under torture are not admitted as evidence in court.[100]

35. JS3 noted that, although Equatorial Guinea is the third largest oil producer in sub-Saharan Africa, it does not regularly publish its oil revenue figures.[101] HRW asserted that there is high-level corruption and mismanagement of public funds and the government's investments in social spending are directed to projects of limited benefit to the most

vulnerable.[102] JS3 stated that there were no mechanisms to monitor expenditure,[103] and recommended adopting a law on access to information by February 2015 and enhancing the independence, operability and resources of the Anti-Corruption Division of the Attorney-General's Office.[104] JS3 recommended establishing transparent and efficient mechanisms for access to public funds.[105] HRW recommended to establish, in consultation with civil society, a clear and transparent fiscal policy to manage revenues, combat official corruption and account for the use of public funds, including by publishing all government revenues, budgets, and spending; conducting and publishing annual audits of all government accounts, including those held abroad; and enforcing a requirement that public officials declare their assets.[106]

4. Right to marriage and family life

36. ACEDEVADEMA noted that trafficked minors were often in the custody of a person who was not a family member, were forced to work for the financial benefit of another family, without being able to leave, and that some girls were forced to marry.[107] ACEDEVADEMA reported that the Government had not put in place any policies for the protection of such minors.[108]

5. Freedom of movement

37. EPIBIB recommended ensuring that persons were allowed to travel freely, without having to request Government permission, and that Bubi women, men and young people living on Bioko island should in future be allowed to freely attend the United Nations forums for indigenous peoples and freely return to the island.[109] EPIBIB recommended removing the military checkpoints at the entrance to Bubi villages.[110]

6. Freedom of religion or belief, expression, association and peaceful assembly, and right to participate in public and political life

38. RWBI asserted that almost all media are state-owned, and remain under the severe censorship of the Ministry of Information, and that no trade unions or journalist defence associations exist.[111] JS1 noted that there was an absolute monopoly over the State media, to which the opposition did not have access.[112] HRW informed that only a few private media outlets exist in Equatorial Guinea, and they are generally owned by persons close to the President.[113] JS3 reported that freedom of expression, thought and opinion was severely curtailed, in part through legal requirements, for example the need for all journalists to be registered beforehand with the official registry.[114] RWBI stated that the 1992 Law on the Press, Publishing, and Audiovisual Media allows the government to censor all media publications, in direct opposition with the UPR recommendations.[115]

39. HRW stated that journalists from state-owned media outlets are unable to criticize the government without risk of censorship or reprisal, while being suspended, sacked or detained, including since the 2009 UPR review.[116] JS2 asserted that journalists are subject to harassment, dismissal and even arrest when they show any degree of independence.[117] RWBI urged the government to improve its policy and attitude regarding freedom of information and to end censorship, mass surveillance, reprisals and harassment against those who provide news and information, allow trade unions and journalist protection associations, and provide a favourable environment for a free and pluralistic media.[118]

40. HRW informed of the use of visa denials, surveillance, harassment, and detentions to hamper independent foreign journalists.[119] HRW recommended authorizing foreign nongovernmental organizations and journalists to enter Equatorial Guinea, travel freely, meet with a range of official and private persons, and carry out independent work without hindrance or risk of retaliation against those who share information.[120]

41. JS3 reported that human rights defenders faced systematic reprisals and could not act freely and independently.[121] JS2 recommended to refrain from intimidating, harassing, arresting and incarcerating human rights defenders to prevent their legitimate human rights work.[122] JS3 drew attention to legal restrictions impeding freedom of association and restricting the activities of NGOs.[123] JS2 affirmed that human rights organizations cannot register or operate as such, and that individual human rights defenders are routinely harassed, risk losing their jobs or professional licenses, are frequently arrested without a warrant and occasionally convicted on spurious charges, mentioning a number of cases.[124] EPIBIB recommended that Bubis should have the freedom to form associations and carry out preparatory activities ahead of the 2014 World Conference on Indigenous Peoples.[125]

42. HRW stated that opposition members are subject to arbitrary arrest and other forms of harassment and, at times, criminal prosecution, while political parties aligned with the ruling party, have funding, and access to national media.[126] HRW recommended to respect the right of opposition members to travel freely, to hold meetings, express their views, and have access to media, as well as to cease harassment of and reprisals against domestic critics.[127] JS1 invited the Government to pledge not to take reprisals against opposition activists.[128] AI recommended to bring to an immediate end the practice of arresting the families of political opponents as hostages.[129]

43. RWBI asserted that, ahead of the parliamentary and municipal elections, opposition websites and Facebook were blocked.[130] JS2 stated that since May 12, all affected sites remain inaccessible via the government provided networks, while the government's and the ruling party's web sites were never interrupted.[131] JS1 recommended freeing up public access to the Internet and allowing the opposition to have access to their websites and social networks.[132]

44. JS2 stated that freedom of assembly is severely curtailed.[133] JS3 reported that anti-Government demonstrations were practically prohibited[134] and that the law imposed extensive restrictions on freedom of assembly and demonstration, including compulsory attendance by the authorities at all meetings and restrictions on the content of advertisements.[135] AI stated that although the law does not require official permission to hold demonstrations, these are not allowed and organisers are often arrested.[136] AI recommended to ensure that nobody is arrested for exercising their rights to freedom of expression, assembly and association.[137]

45. JS3 stated that, generally speaking, the Government systematically excluded the majority of civil society groups from formulating public policy.[138] JS2 state that on April 2010 the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative board rejected Equatorial Guinea's candidacy for failure to comply with the organization's rules, which require inter alia, genuine participation of civil society.[139]

7. Right to work and to just and favourable conditions of work

46. ACEDEVADEMA said that the majority of workers in the construction sector and industry in Malabo and Bata were exploited by the companies that hired them.[140]

8. Right to social security and to an adequate standard of living

47. HRW affirmed that Equatorial Guinea has a per-capita gross domestic product of $32,026, the highest wealth ranking of any African country, yet it has by far the largest gap between its per-capita wealth and its human development score.[141] JS3 reported that poverty rates had not fallen in the past four years (at least 75 per cent of the population is still living in poverty).[142] JS3 pointed out that a large proportion of the population still had no access to basic services and that 77 per cent lived on less than 2 dollars a day.[143] HRW stated that half of the population of Equatorial Guinea lacked clean water or basic sanitation facilities

in 2012.[144] JS2 stated they observed no significant improvements in the attainment of rights to health, education, water and sanitation, despite significant government investment in lavish resorts and other infrastructure projects that fail to prioritize or address poverty alleviation.[145]

48. JS3 reported that, in 2012–2013, only 22 per cent of the budget was allocated to social spending, which was well below the 66 per cent average in the countries of the Economic Community of Central African States.[146] JS3 recommended increasing the share of the budget allocated to social spending to at least 45 per cent of the total, establishing independent monitoring and evaluation mechanisms and developing a national poverty reduction plan with an independent monitoring mechanism.[147]

9. Right to health

49. JS3 referred to the poor state of the infrastructure in hospitals, which lacked equipment and adequate supplies.[148] JS3 pointed out that there was no transparency with respect to the public funding of hospitals and the general public still had difficulty in accessing medical services.[149]

50. JS3 said that, according to official data, the maternal mortality rate was 352 deaths per 100,000 inhabitants, 21.8 per cent of which were due to HIV/AIDS, and that in practice most of the cost of health services was paid directly by the patients. No measures were being taken to increase medical cover, although only 9 per cent of women and 16 per cent of men were covered by social security.[150] JS3 indicated that the national programme to combat HIV/AIDS had serious shortcomings, including a lack of financial and human resources.[151]

51. JS3 commended the measures taken to combat malaria but noted that, nonetheless, malaria was the cause of 38 per cent of deaths among children under 5, and in general, the infant mortality rate was 123 for every 1,000 live births.[152]

52. JS3 recommended establishing the Ministry of Health by December 2014 as well as drawing up a plan to ensure adequate supplies in all hospitals and creating mechanisms for inspecting sanitary conditions and training in private clinics and centres of traditional medicine.[153]

10. Right to education

53. JS3 drew attention to the shortcomings of the education system and the average of 5.4 years of schooling, which had not changed since 2010,[154] noting that the Government had not taken any steps to guarantee the right to free education, that there were still major discrepancies between urban and rural areas, and that there was still a large proportion of teachers with no vocational training.[155]

54. JS3 said that the Government had not taken any measures to promote university education for women and that the national programme to reduce female illiteracy was still at the organizational stage after more than three years.[156]

55. JS3 recommended guaranteeing the quality and coverage of primary education and ensuring that it was free by providing more public schools, reaching agreements with private centres to cover the costs of school fees, establishing compulsory training programmes for all teachers and ensuring that all vacant positions were filled by teacher training college graduates.[157]

11. Cultural rights

56. EPIBIB mentioned the case of the village of Ureka, where the Government had built roads inside a nature reserve, and suggested that existing paths should be adapted instead to generate sustainable development while preserving Bubi traditions.[158]

12. Persons with disabilities

57. JS3 noted that persons with disabilities were discriminated against in all sectors and faced major difficulties in finding employment and that the Government had not taken any steps to promote special education, vocational training or employment for that group of the population.[159] JS3 pointed out that there was no legislation covering persons with disabilities and that the Government had not provided adequate administrative protection measures to facilitate better access to social services for persons with disabilities.[160] JS3 indicated that there was a social assistance programme for persons with disabilities but that it had insufficient resources and limited access to rehabilitation services.[161]

13. Indigenous peoples

58. EPIBIB recommended establishing a constructive dialogue between the Government of Equatorial Guinea and the Bubi people of Bioko island in the United Nations, using the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples as the basis for discussions.[162] EPIBIB recommended that Equatorial Guinea should apply a number of the articles of that Declaration.[163]

59. EPIBIB expressed the wish that the Bubi people be able to speak of their right to self-determination on that account being detained, tortured or murdered[164] and recommended that all Bubis from Bioko island who had had to flee the country, including those expelled by the Government, should be allowed to return freely.[165]

60. EPIBIB reminded the Government of Equatorial Guinea that it had signed the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination and recommended that it should comply with General Recommendation XXI (48) adopted by the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination in 1996 so as to recognize the right to self-determination of the Bubi people.[166]

14. Migrants, refugees and asylum seekers

61. ACEDEVADEMA noted that African immigrants were particularly vulnerable to being arbitrarily detained by the authorities of Equatorial Guinea, having their property confiscated and subsequently being expelled from the country without explanation.[167]

62. JS2 stated that foreign nationals suspected of being undocumented migrants are frequently targeted, ill-treated by the security forces in periodic raids on their homes and neighbourhoods, beaten, have their property stolen, and are imprisoned and held in inhuman conditions for weeks or months before eventually being deported, often regardless of their legal status in the country.[168]

15. Right to development and environmental issues

63. EPIBIB stated that the three protected nature reserve areas on Bioko island, which were home to animal species that were not found anywhere else in the world, were being plundered despite the fact that the Government had signed treaties on the protection of biodiversity and the environment.[169] EPIBIB noted that the Bubi people of Bioko island were discriminated against when it came to protecting biodiversity and the environment and recommended respecting the protected nature reserve areas.[170]

Notes

[1] The stakeholders listed below have contributed information for this summary; the full texts of all original submissions are available at: www.ohchr.org.

Civil society
Individual submissions:

AI	Amnesty International, London (United Kingdom);
ACEDEVEMA	Asociación Cultural en Defensa de los Valores y Derechos de la Mujer Africana, Toledo (Spain);
EPIBIB	El Pueblo Indígena Bubi de la Isla de Bioko, (Equatorial Guinea);
GIEACPC	Global Initiative to End all Corporal Punishment of Children, London (United Kingdom);
HRW	Human Rights Watch, New York (United States of America);
RWBI	Reporters Without Borders International, Paris (France);

Joint submissions:

JS1	**Joint submission 1 submitted by:** CPDS: Convergencia para la Democracia Social de Guinea Ecuatorial, Malabo (Equatorial Guinea); and ASODEGUE: Asociación para la Solidaridad Democrática con Guinea Ecuatorial, Madrid (Spain);
JS2	**Joint submission 2 submitted by:** EGJUSTICE: Toward a Just Equatorial Guinea, Washington D.C. (United States of America); and RIDH: International Network of Human Rights, Geneva (Switzerland);
JS3	**Joint submission 3 submitted by:** GDDHH-CNOSCGE: Grupo de Derechos Humanos de la Coordinadora Nacional de Organizaciones de la Sociedad Civil de Guinea Ecuatorial, Malabo (Equatorial Guinea); CEID: Centro de Estudios e iniciativas para el Desarrollo, Malabo (Equatorial Guinea); SEJOF: Sensación del Joven Futuro de Guinea Ecuatorial, Malabo (Equatorial Guinea).

[2] JS2-EGJUSTICE-RIDH, para. 11.
[3] AI, p. 1.
[4] HRW, p. 5.
[5] AI, p. 5.
[6] JS3-GDDHH-CNOSCGE, p. 15.
[7] JS1-CPDS-ASODEGUE, para. 26.
[8] JS3-GDDHH-CNOSCGE, para. 17.
[9] HRW, p. 4.
[10] JS2-EGJUSTICE-RIDH, para. 8.
[11] HRW, p. 4. See also: JS1-CPDS-ASODEGUE, para.26 and JS2-EGJUSTICE-RIDH, para. 8.
[12] HRW, p. 5.
[13] JS1-CPDS-ASODEGUE, para. 32.
[14] JS1-CPDS-ASODEGUE, p. 8.
[15] AI, p. 2.
[16] HRW, p. 4.
[17] JS2-EGJUSTICE-RIDH, para. 10. See also: AI, p. 2.
[18] AI, p. 2.
[19] JS1-CPDS-ASODEGUE, para. 5. See also: JS3-GDDHH-CNOSCGE, para. 14.
[20] RWBI, p. 3.
[21] JS2-EGJUSTICE-RIDH, para. 9. See also: HRW, p. 4.
[22] HRW, p. 4.
[23] AI, p. 2.
[24] AI, p. 2.
[25] JS3-GDDHH-CNOSCGE, p. 15.
[26] JS3-GDDHH-CNOSCGE, para. 13.
[27] JS3-GDDHH-CNOSCGE, para. 13.
[28] JS3-GDDHH-CNOSCGE, p. 15. See also: AI, p. 2.
[29] JS3-GDDHH-CNOSCGE, p. 15.

[30] JS2-EGJUSTICE-RIDH, para. 11.
[31] JS2-EGJUSTICE-RIDH, para. 5.
[32] HRW, p. 5.
[33] HRW, p. 5.
[34] JS1-CPDS-ASODEGUE, para. 5.
[35] JS3-GDDHH-CNOSCGE, p. 15.
[36] EPIBIB, p. 2.
[37] EPIBIB, p. 2.
[38] EPIBIB, p. 5.
[39] HRW, p. 5. See also: JS1-CPDS-ASODEGUE, para. 43.
[40] HRW, p. 5. See also: JS1-CPDS-ASODEGUE, para. 43 and AI, p. 2.
[41] JS1-CPDS-ASODEGUE, para. 5.
[42] AI, p. 2.
[43] JS3-GDDHH-CNOSCGE, para. 20.
[44] JS3-GDDHH-CNOSCGE, p. 15. See also: JS1-CPDS-ASODEGUE, para. 8.
[45] AI, p. 2.
[46] AI, p. 3. See also: JS2-EGJUSTICE-RIDH, paras. 22 and 23.
[47] JS3-GDDHH-CNOSCGE, para. 21.
[48] JS1-CPDS-ASODEGUE, p. 8.
[49] EPIBIB, p. 5.
[50] JS2-EGJUSTICE-RIDH, para. 7. See also: AI, p. 1.
[51] JS2-EGJUSTICE-RIDH, p. 8.
[52] AI, p. 3.
[53] AI, p. 5.
[54] JS3-GDDHH-CNOSCGE, para. 25.
[55] JS2-EGJUSTICE-RIDH, para. 12. See also: JS1-CPDS-ASODEGUE and JS3-GDDHH-CNOSCGE, para. 20.
[56] AI, p. 1.
[57] AI, p. 5.
[58] JS2-EGJUSTICE-RIDH, para. 17. See also: HRW, p. 4.
[59] AI, pp. 1 and 4.
[60] JS2-EGJUSTICE-RIDH, p. 8. See also: AI, p. 4.
[61] HRW, p. 4. See also: AI, p. 1.
[62] AI, p. 5.
[63] JS1-CPDS-ASODEGUE, p. 8.
[64] JS1-CPDS-ASODEGUE, p. 8.
[65] JS1-CPDS-ASODEGUE, paras. 9 to 19. See also: JS2-EGJUSTICE-RIDH, paras. 17 to 19.
[66] HRW, p. 4.
[67] JS1-CPDS-ASODEGUE, paras. 19 to 24.
[68] JS3-GDDHH-CNOSCGE, para. 23.
[69] JS3-GDDHH-CNOSCGE, para. 23.
[70] JS3-GDDHH-CNOSCGE, p. 15.
[71] JS1-CPDS-ASODEGUE, p. 8.
[72] JS3-GDDHH-CNOSCGE, para. 35.
[73] ACEDEVEMA, para. 7.
[74] ACEDEVEMA, para. 10.
[75] ACEDEVEMA, para. 5.
[76] ACEDEVEMA, para. 5.
[77] ACEDEVEMA, para. 6.
[78] ACEDEVEMA, para. 10.
[79] ACEDEVEMA, paras. 3 and 4.
[80] ACEDEVEMA, p. 5.
[81] ACEDEVEMA, paras. 8 and 14.
[82] ACEDEVEMA, para. 17.
[83] JS3-GDDHH-CNOSCGE, para. 34.
[84] JS3-GDDHH-CNOSCGE, para. 34.

[85] GIEACPC, p. 1.
[86] HRW, pp. 1 and 2.
[87] AI, p. 2.
[88] AI, p. 2.
[89] AI, p. 3.
[90] HRW, p. 4.
[91] JS3-GDDHH-CNOSCGE, para. 15.
[92] JS3-GDDHH-CNOSCGE, para. 15.
[93] JS3-GDDHH-CNOSCGE, para. 18.
[94] JS3-GDDHH-CNOSCGE, para. 15.
[95] JS2-EGJUSTICE-RIDH, para. 12.
[96] HRW, p. 5.
[97] JS3-GDDHH-CNOSCGE, para. 16.
[98] AI, p. 2.
[99] AI, p. 2.
[100] AI, p. 5.
[101] JS3-GDDHH-CNOSCGE, para. 28.
[102] HRW, p. 2.
[103] JS3-GDDHH-CNOSCGE, para. 26.
[104] JS3-GDDHH-CNOSCGE, p. 16.
[105] JS3-GDDHH-CNOSCGE, p. 15.
[106] HRW, p. 5. See also: JS1-CPDS-ASODEGUE, para.7. See also: JS3-GDDHH-CNOSCGE, p. 16.
[107] ACEDEVEMA, paras. 9 and 10.
[108] ACEDEVEMA, para. 10.
[109] EPIBIB, p. 5.
[110] EPIBIB, p. 6.
[111] RWBI, pp. 1 and 2.
[112] JS1-CPDS-ASODEGUE, para. 30. See also: JS3-GDDHH-CNOSCGE, para. 6.
[113] HRW, pp.1, 2 and 4. See also RWBI, pp. 1 and 2 and JS3-GDDHH-CNOSCGE, para. 6.
[114] JS3-GDDHH-CNOSCGE, para. 6.
[115] RWBI, p. 3.
[116] HRW, p. 2. See also: JS3-GDDHH-CNOSCGE, para. 7.
[117] JS2-EGJUSTICE-RIDH, paras. 24 and 25 to 27. See also: JS3-GDDHH-CNOSCGE, para. 7 and JS1-CPDS-ASODEGUE, paras. 33 and 34.
[118] RWBI, p. 3.
[119] HRW, p. 3. See also: RWBI, p. 2.
[120] HRW, p. 5.
[121] JS3-GDDHH-CNOSCGE, paras. 10 and 11.
[122] JS2-EGJUSTICE-RIDH, p. 8.
[123] JS3-GDDHH-CNOSCGE, para. 10.
[124] JS2-EGJUSTICE-RIDH, paras. 13, 14 and 16. See also: JS3-GDDHH-CNOSCGE, para. 25.
[125] EPIBIB, p. 5.
[126] HRW, p. 4.
[127] HRW, p. 5.
[128] JS1-CPDS-ASODEGUE, p. 8.
[129] AI, p. 4.
[130] RWBI, p. 2.
[131] JS2-EGJUSTICE-RIDH, para. 29. See also: JS1-CPDS-ASODEGUE, para. 32.
[132] JS1-CPDS-ASODEGUE, p. 8.
[133] JS2-EGJUSTICE-RIDH, para. 27.
[134] JS3-GDDHH-CNOSCGE, para. 9.
[135] JS3-GDDHH-CNOSCGE, para. 8.
[136] AI, p. 4. See also: JS1-CPDS-ASODEGUE, paras. 35 and 36 and JS2-EGJUSTICE-RIDH, para. 28.
[137] AI, p. 5.
[138] JS3-GDDHH-CNOSCGE, para. 17.
[139] JS2-EGJUSTICE-RIDH, para. 6.

[140] ACEDEVEMA, para. 13.
[141] HRW, p. 2.
[142] JS3-GDDHH-CNOSCGE, para. 43.
[143] JS3-GDDHH-CNOSCGE, paras. 4 and 44.
[144] HRW, p. 2.
[145] JS2-EGJUSTICE-RIDH, para. 4.
[146] JS3-GDDHH-CNOSCGE, para. 43.
[147] JS3-GDDHH-CNOSCGE, p. 16 and para.43. See also: HRW, p. 5.
[148] JS3-GDDHH-CNOSCGE, para. 41.
[149] JS3-GDDHH-CNOSCGE, para. 42.
[150] JS3-GDDHH-CNOSCGE, para. 39. See also: HRW, p. 2.
[151] JS3-GDDHH-CNOSCGE, para. 40.
[152] JS3-GDDHH-CNOSCGE, para. 39.
[153] JS3-GDDHH-CNOSCGE, p. 15.
[154] JS3-GDDHH-CNOSCGE, para. 36.
[155] JS3-GDDHH-CNOSCGE, paras. 37 and 38.
[156] JS3-GDDHH-CNOSCGE, para. 33.
[157] JS3-GDDHH-CNOSCGE, p. 16.
[158] EPIBIB, p. 3.
[159] JS3-GDDHH-CNOSCGE, para. 31.
[160] JS3-GDDHH-CNOSCGE, para. 29.
[161] JS3-GDDHH-CNOSCGE, paras. 29 and 30.
[162] EPIBIB, p. 4.
[163] EPIBIB, p. 4.
[164] EPIBIB, p. 4.
[165] EPIBIB, p. 4.
[166] EPIBIB, p. 5.
[167] ACEDEVEMA, para. 12.
[168] JS2-EGJUSTICE-RIDH, para. 21.
[169] EPIBIB, p. 3.
[170] EPIBIB, p. 3.